

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of TROY PECKHAM, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GAYLE WILLIAMSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CHARLES PECKHAM,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

September 24, 1999

No. 215740

Oakland Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 94-058759 NA

Before: Markman, P.J., and Saad and P.D. Houk,* JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from a family court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i). We affirm.

The family court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory ground for termination was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Contrary to what respondent-appellant argues, termination of parental rights was authorized under the court rules. See MCR 5.974(F). Next, limiting our review to the record, respondent-appellant has not established entitlement to relief due to ineffective assistance of counsel. *People v LaVearn*, 448 Mich 207, 216; 528 NW2d 721 (1995); *People v Pickens*, 446 Mich 298, 302-303; 521 NW2d 797 (1994). Respondent-appellant also failed to show that that termination of her parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA

* Circuit judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Thus, the family court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the child. *In re Hall-Smith, supra*.

Respondent-appellant's remaining claims, regarding the absence of a guardian ad litem and alleged judicial bias, are not raised in the statement of questions presented and, therefore, appellate review is inappropriate. *Brookshire-Big Tree Ass'n v Oneida Twp*, 225 Mich App 196, 201; 570 NW2d 294 (1997). Regardless, there is no basis in the record for concluding that respondent-appellant is entitled to relief with respect to either of these claims. See *In re Hamlet (After Remand)*, 225 Mich App 505, 518; 571 NW2d 750 (1997).

Affirmed.

/s/ Stephen J. Markman

/s/ Henry William Saad

/s/ Peter D. Houk